



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

DAVOOD KHALILI  
P.O. BOX 743  
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

**COPY MAILED**

MAR 20 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Khalili, Davood  
Application No. 10/790,437  
Filed: February 23, 2004  
Title: Laser Pointer

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), filed November 25, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No further petition fee is required for the request. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply,
- (2) the petition fee,
- (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, and
- (4) a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed on or before June 8, 1995 or if the application is a design application.

Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Commissioner may require additional information.<sup>2</sup>

The instant petition continues to lack item (1) and now also lacks item (3).

As to item (1), petitioner has still not provided a proper response to the Office action of September 2005. As stated in the previous petition decision, in order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The

<sup>1</sup> In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

<sup>2</sup> See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(C) and (D).

applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements. In amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application or patent under reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty, which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. The applicant or patent owner must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. *See MPEP 1.111(b) and (c).*

As to item (3), there are three periods to be considered during the evaluation of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b):

- (1) the delay in reply that originally resulted in the abandonment;
- (2) the delay in filing an initial petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application; and
- (3) the delay in filing a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application.

Currently, the delay has not been shown to the satisfaction of the Director to be unintentional for period (3). The previous petition decision mailed May 10, 2007 gave a two month time period for reply, with extensions of time permitted under 37 CFR 1.136(a). However, the renewed petition was not filed until November 25, 2008, over a year later. Any future petition must explain the delay in filing the renewed petition.

Further, petitioner requests the return of the \$750.00 petition fee submitted on March 19, 2007. The relief requested in this petition cannot be granted because 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(7) provides that a petition for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application must be accompanied by a petition fee, unless the petition is filed under 35 U.S.C. 133 or 151 on the basis of unavoidable delay. Thus, the payment of a petition fee to obtain the revival of an abandoned application is a statutory prerequisite to revival of the abandoned application, and cannot be refunded.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS  
Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Window located at:  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3206.



Liana Walsh  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions